



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/776,881	02/11/2004	Carlton Grant Willson	PA84-26D27	3386
7590	10/04/2007		EXAMINER	
Kelly K. Kordzik Winstead Sechrest and Minick P.C. P.O. Box 50784 Dallas, TX 75201			LUK, EMMANUEL S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1722	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/04/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/776,881	WILLSON ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Emmanuel S. Luk	1722

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 May 2007.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                  2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §.119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/07;7/05;5/05;3/05;2/05;7/04</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION*****Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1, 2, 10; 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Rohner (5948219).

Art Unit: 1722

Rohner teaches the claimed lithographic apparatus that uses an electric field supplied by a source 18 to form features from a desired material by a template 16, the template having recessed portions 22.

The source of voltage in electrical communication with the template and the claimed magnitude are intended use of the apparatus. The electrical field gradient is a variable property that is inherent upon the source of voltage and it is not constant. The voltage can be modified/changed by the user and as such it is an intended use. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the voltage to calibrate and find the optimum field strength/gradient for use of the apparatus depending on the user's desire.

5. Claims 3-7, 11-15, and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rohner as applied to claims 1, 2, 10, 18, and 19 above, and further in view of Mancini (6387787)

Rohner fails to teach the template having protrusion comprising of Indium Tin Oxide, fused silica, and being transparent to UV light.

Mancini teaches a lithographic template that needs to be transparent and suggests using materials such as indium tin oxide, silicon dioxide, silicon oxy-nitride (c. 5, l. 3-7) and the use of typical quartz plate (c. 1, l. 44). The use of the template of Mancini is to form patterns on a substrate and then to cure using radiation through the transparent template. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Rohner with the materials used for the template to allow for further curing of the

Art Unit: 1722

product via radiation (which would include UV radiation). The materials taught by Mancini includes indium tin oxide, and various fused silica, thus the patterns of the material on the template is known and would be readily available to one of ordinary skill in the art.

6. Claims 8, 9, 16, 17, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rohner as applied to claims 1, 2, 10, 18, and 19 above, and further in view of Chou (2002/0167117).

Rohner fails to teach a Fluorine based monolayer as an additional layer on the template.

However, Chou teaches in nanoimprint lithography of the additional thin coatings of persistent release materials, here it is known that the material can be Fluorine as seen in the abstract. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Rohner with the release layer as taught by Chou because it allows for improved product release properties for the mold. One would be motivated to use the Chou reference since it is in the same field of endeavor of nanoimprint lithography and that one would recognize the benefits of the layer for its release properties.

### ***Conclusion***

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emmanuel S. Luk whose telephone number is (571) 272-1134. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Fridays from 9 to 5.

Art Unit: 1722

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra N. Gupta can be reached on (571) 272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

EL

  
YOGENDRA N GUPTA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700